UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,462	06/27/2003	Brian Meyers	MSFT121083	9377

26389 7590 07/03/2006

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
LAY, MICHELLE K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/608,462	MEYERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michelle K. Lay	2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13 and 15-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13 and 15-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 June 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed on 06/09/2006, has been entered and made of record. Claims 1-13, and 15-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/09/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues Horvitz et al. (5,880,733) fails to teach or suggest determining if the graphical component is to be moved. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Horvitz teaches that the graphical window is moved depending on the type of button selected. Horvitz further teaches a computer program used to implement the various steps of Horvitz and is located in the memory unit (20) of Fig. 2, and the processes of Horvitz are carried out through the use of a CPU (22) [col. 7, lines 5-9]. Thus, the computer program determines the location based on button that is chosen.

Applicant argues Horvitz further fails to teach or suggest an open location. Examiner respectively disagrees. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horvitz to have the graphical components be moved so that the components are not tiled so that the user is able to see the content of each component regardless of the point of focus. This would be advantageous to the user so that at a quick glance, the user knows the general content without having to click the graphical component and place it in the main view.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims **1-8**, **17**, **20**, **21**, **23/1**, **23/3**, **23/4**, **23/8**, **23/20**, **24/1**, **24/3**, **24/4**, **24/8**, **24/20**, and **25-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz et al. (5,880,733).

Horvitz teaches the limitations of claims **1-8**, **17**, **20**, **21**, **23/1**, **23/3**, **23/4**, **23/8**, **23/20**, **24/1**, **24/3**, **24/4**, **24/8**, **24/20**, and **25-27**, with the exception of explicitly teaching determining if said graphical component is to be moved from the current location of the graphical component to another location however, Horvitz teaches a window based display system where the user may active control buttons to alter the location of the windows.

In regards to claim **1**, Horvitz teaches ***a computer-implemented method of moving a graphical component from one location to another location in a graphical interface, the method comprising:***

- ***if said graphical component is to be moved, determining a destination location for said graphical component;***

  Referring to Fig. 3, the type of button, i.e., push back button (64) [col. 12, lines 31-50], perspective-transform left button (66) [col. 12, line 51 – col. 13, lines 9], and

perspective-transform right button (68) [col. 13, lines 11-38], determines the destination of where the window will be moved.

- ***moving, in a single step, said graphical component from the current location of the graphical component to said destination.***

  As an example, when the push back button (64) is pressed, the window is displayed or moved to either the front plane (38) or back plane depending on its current location. If the push back button (64) is selected and the window was on the front plane (38) then the window is zoomed backward [col. 12, lines 31-50]. Although Horvitz does not explicitly teach moving the window in a single step, it is implicit that when the window is zoomed backward, it is not done incrementally, but it one motion.

Although Horvitz does not explicitly teach ***in response to the selection of a graphical component, determining if said graphical component is to be moved from the current location of the graphical component to another location; and said destination location comprising an open location in said graphical interface;***

It is implicit that by the selection of the type of button (64, 66, 68), it is determined that window (38) is to be moved to another location, either back via button (64), left via button (66), or right via button (68). Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horvitz to have the graphical components be moved so that the components are not tiled so that the user is able to see the content of each component regardless of the point of focus. This would be advantageous to the user so that at a quick glance, the user knows the

general content without having to click the graphical component and place it in the main view.

In regards to claim **2**, Horvitz teaches ***further comprising receiving a desired direction for said destination.***

Referring to Fig. 3, the type of button, i.e., push back button (64) [col. 12, lines 31-50], perspective-transform left button (66) [col. 12, line 51 – col. 13, lines 9], and perspective-transform right button (68) [col. 13, lines 11-38], determines the destination of where the window will be moved. Thus, when the push back button (64) is pressed, the desired direction is either front or back, depending on the current location of the window.

In regards to claim **3**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said graphical component is a window.***

Fig. 1, window (30) [col. 8, lines 40-45]

In regards to claim **4**, Horvitz teaches ***further comprising determining that said destination is located in a display region with a new resolution, and automatically resizing said window in proportion to said new resolution.***

Figs. 4A-C illustrate the push back button operation. When the button is selected, the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B). The window (410) shown in Fig. 4C has been fully

zoomed backward to the background where the window (410) and its contents (415) have been rescaled to appear at distance from the front plane (38) [col. 14, lines 38-50]. Although Horvitz does not explicitly teach a new resolution, it is implicit that the depiction of moving the window backwards (i.e. Fig. 4C), results in the window (410) to be displayed with a new resolution since it will take less pixels to represent the window (410). Thus, the contents (415) are automatically resized to be in proportion to the new resolution.

In regards to claim **5**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said graphical component is selected by an input device***.

Fig. 1, mouse (21), cursor (23). Fig. 4A, cursor (23) selects button (64) on window (410).

In regards to claim **6**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein determining if said graphical component is to be moved is based on a signal from an input device***.

Figs. 4A-C illustrate the push back button operation. When the button is selected via a cursor (23), the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B). The cursor (23) is manipulated via the mouse [Fig. 1, (21)], which provides a signal.

In regards to claim **7**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said signal from an input device includes a desired direction to move said graphical component.***

Referring to Fig. 3, the type of button, i.e., push back button (64) [col. 12, lines 31-50], perspective-transform left button (66) [col. 12, line 51 – col. 13, lines 9], and perspective-transform right button (68) [col. 13, lines 11-38], determines the destination (*said desired direction*) of where the window will be moved. The user pushes the desired button via the mouse (21) therefore, providing a *signal* to the CPU [Fig. 2 (22)] via the bus [Fig. 2 (24)] as to the desired direction to move the window.

In regards to claim **8**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein determining a destination location for said graphical component comprises determining a destination location that lies a predetermined distance from the current location of the graphical component.***

Figs. 4A-C illustrate the push back button operation. When the button is selected, the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B). The window (410) shown in Fig. 4C has been fully zoomed backward to the background where the window (410) and its contents (415) have been rescaled to appear at distance from the front plane (38) [col. 14, lines 38-50]. Although Horvitz does not explicitly teach a distance, it is implicit that the method of Horvitz has a predetermined location for the window (410) when the button of specified operation is pressed. Thus, having a predetermined location inherently results in a predetermined distance from the current location of window (410). Additionally, Fig. 11 illustrates the system for defining the

perspective transform based environment and for providing and defining the positions in which a window may be displayed [col. 17, lines 16-65].

In regards to claim **17**, Horvitz teaches ***further comprising resizing said graphical component to fit within said open location***.

Figs. 4A-C illustrate the push back button operation. The window (410) shown in Fig. 4C has been fully zoomed backward to the background where the window (410) and its contents (415) have been rescaled to appear at distance from the front plane (38) [col. 14, lines 38-50]. Thus, the window (410) and its contents (415) have been rescaled to fit within the background (*said open location*). Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horvitz to have the graphical components be moved so that the components are not tiled so that the user is able to see the content of each component regardless of the point of focus. This would be advantageous to the user so that at a quick glance, the user knows the general content without having to click the graphical component and place it in the main view.

In regards to claim **20**, Horvitz teaches ***further comprising displaying an indication of said destination location.***

Referring to Fig. 8A-B, when the user clicks on the button (710) and indicates the perspective-transform right operation, a plane direction arrow (830) points towards the right plane (56) (*said displaying an indication*).

In regards to claim **21**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein moving said graphical component comprises animating the movement of said graphical component to said destination location.***

Figs. 4A-C illustrate the push back button operation. When the button is selected, the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B). The window (410) shown in Fig. 4C has been fully zoomed backward to the background [col. 14, lines 38-50]. Although Horvitz does not explicitly teach animating the movement of the window, it is implicit that the window (410) is animated since Horvitz describes the final result [Fig. 4C] as being zoomed backward. Additionally, Horvitz provides Fig. 4B which illustrates the intermediate steps of Fig. 4A and the result, Fig. 4C, implying animation from one screen to the other via the arrows.

In regards to claim **23/1**, **23/3**, **23/4**, **23/8**, **23/20**, Horvitz teaches ***a computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions for performing the method of the claimed invention***.

A computer program is used to implement the various steps of Horvitz and is located in the memory unit (20) of Fig. 2, and the processes of Horvitz are carried out through the use of a CPU (22) [col. 7, lines 5-9].

In regards to claim **24/1**, **24/3**, **24/4**, **24/8**, **24/20**, Horvitz teaches ***a computer system having a processor and a memory storing computer-executable instructions operative to perform the method of the claimed invention.***

A computer program is used to implement the various steps of Horvitz and is located in the memory unit (20) of Fig. 2, and the processes of Horvitz are carried out through the use of a CPU (22) [col. 7, lines 5-9].

In regards to claim **25**, claim 25 recites similar limitations as claim 1 and thus, is rejected with the same basis and rationale as claim 1. Furthermore, the system of Horvitz as illustrated in Fig. 1, includes a graphical user interface (12) on a computer display screen (15) of a display monitor (14). The system receives input data from input devices (21) to move a cursor (23) on the display screen (15) for selection of various options [col. 6, lines 27-65].

In regards to claim **26**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said window is moved to an optimal open destination on said display.***

As an example, Figs. 4A-C illustrate the push back button operation. When the button is selected, the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B) [col. 14, lines 38-50]. Thus, based on which button the user chooses, the system of Horvitz decides where to place window (410), i.e. the optimal location. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horvitz to have the graphical components be

moved so that the components are not tiled so that the user is able to see the content of each component regardless of the point of focus. This would be advantageous to the user so that at a quick glance, the user knows the general content without having to click the graphical component and place it in the main view.

In regards to claim **27**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said optimal open destination is located according to predetermined criteria.***

As an example, Figs. 4A-C illustrate the push back button operation. When the button is selected, the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B) [col. 14, lines 38-50]. Thus, based on which button the user chooses (*predetermined criteria*), the system of Horvitz decides where to place window (410), i.e. the optimal location. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horvitz to have the graphical components be moved so that the components are not tiled so that the user is able to see the content of each component regardless of the point of focus. This would be advantageous to the user so that at a quick glance, the user knows the general content without having to click the graphical component and place it in the main view.

2. Claims **9-13**, **15**, **16**, **18**, **19**, **22**, **23/9**, **23/22**, **24/9**, **24/22**, and **28**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz et al. (5,880,733) in view of Butler et al. (US Patent No. 6,573,913 B1).

Horvitz teaches the limitations of claim **9-13**, **15**, **16**, **18**, **19**, **22**, **23/9**, **23/22**, **24/9**, **24/22**, and **28** with the exception of disclosing a second display and weighted value. However, Butler teaches a system and method for repositioning and displaying object in multiple monitor environments.

In regards to claim **9**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***wherein determining a destination location for said graphical component comprises determining the current location of the graphical component on a current display region, and designating an analogous location of another display region as said destination location.***

Horvitz teaches have multiple isometric spaces (161, 163, 165, 167), with separating boundary planes (171, 173, 175, 177) such as that illustrated in Fig. 13. Each space contains a set of planes and windows at various positions and configurations. The user can rotate to a selected isometric space by selecting isometric space selection controls (181, 183) [col. 19, lines 33-62].

Butler teaches a systems and methods for repositioning and displaying objects in multiple monitor environments. The display windows appearing on the screen are contained within a logical space corresponding to the desktop. As shown in the flowchart of Fig. 9, MoveCursor( ) determines which monitor is

closest in Euclidean distance to each of the monitors (904) [col. 10, line 6]. Once determined, Movecursor( ) picks the monitor having the shortest distance to the clipped point and moves the cursor to a location on the edge (or just inside) of that monitor space (906) (*said analogous location*) [col. 10, lines 66 – 67].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Horvitz to include the multiple monitor environment of Butler so that instead of having to use the selection controls (181, 183) to rotate to a selected space, the multiple spaces can be displayed in front of the user at the same time. Additionally, this would aid in alleviating the problem of screen clutter when an end-user has a large number of display regions open on the monitor at the same time [Butler et al.: column 1, lines 54 – 56].

In regards to claim **10**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***wherein said current display is located on one display and said other display region is located on another display***.

With the art rejection of claim 9 provided herein, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art with the combination of Horvitz in view of Butler to have the current window located on one display and the other display region (i.e. multiple isometric spaces (161, 163, 165, 167)) on another display so that instead of having to use the selection controls (181, 183) to rotate to a selected space, the multiple spaces can be displayed in front of the user at the same time. The same reasons for combining as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claim **11**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***wherein said analogous location is located at substantially the same pixel coordinates as the pixel coordinates of said current location.***

Butler illustrates in Fig. 13(b) the graphical component being repositioned from its current location (101) to location (105) within the second display (47), at a decent distance from the display region edges. The new pixel coordinates of the relocated graphical component are consequently close to the initial location of the graphical component. The same reasons for combining as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claim **12**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***wherein said analogous location is proportionately distant from the edges of said other display region as said current location is from the edges at said current display region.***

Butler illustrates in Fig. 13(b) the graphical component being repositioned from its current location (101) to location (105) within the second display (47), at a decent distance from the display region edges. The same reasons for combining as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claim **13**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***further comprising shifting said graphical component if said graphical component does not fit within said other display region.***

Butler illustrates in Fig. 13(b) the graphical component being repositioned from it's current location (101) to location (105) within the second display (47), at a decent distance from the display region edges (claim **12**: location is distant from edges). The new pixel coordinates of the relocated graphical component are consequently close to the initial location of the graphical component. Furthermore, if there is no space on the original monitor, the window is moved. It is determined in step (114) whether the window was moved to a position that causes it to span the boundary between its original monitor and any other monitor [col. 16, lines 60-65]. The same reasons for combining as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claim **15**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said open location is a portion of a display region having no blocking graphical components***.

As an example, Figs. 4A-C of Horvitz illustrates the push back button operation. When the button is selected, the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B) [col. 14, lines 38-50] where no other window is located. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horvitz to have the graphical components be moved so that the components are not tiled so that the user is able to see the content of each component regardless of the point of focus. This would be advantageous to the user so that at a quick glance, the user knows the general content without having to click the graphical component and place it in the main view.

In regards to claim **16**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said open location is at least the size of said graphical component.***

As an example, Figs. 4A-C of Horvitz illustrates the push back button operation. When the button is selected, the window (410) and its data content (415) are moved to the back plane (44) (see Fig. 4B) [col. 14, lines 38-50]. Furthermore, because the location is predetermined it is implicit that window (410) will fit in the location. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Horvitz to have the graphical components be moved so that the components are not tiled so that the user is able to see the content of each component regardless of the point of focus. This would be advantageous to the user so that at a quick glance, the user knows the general content without having to click the graphical component and place it in the main view.

In regards to claim **18**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said blocking graphical components include the information bearing portions of other graphic components.***

Referring to Fig. 3 of Horvitz, windows (53, 58) (*said blocking graphical components*) have text within each window (*said information bearing portions*).

In regards to claim **19**, Horvitz teaches ***wherein said blocking graphical components include other graphical components accessed within a predetermined time period prior to determining a destination location for said graphical component.***

Referring to Fig. 1 of Horvitz, window (30) may contain additional, smaller windows called "child windows" (*said other graphical components*), that may take the form of push buttons [col. 8, lines 55-65]. Window (30) describes the same structure of all the windows, such as window (72) and (71) (*said blocking graphical components*). It is implicit that these windows (71, 72) can be accessed prior to decision of the destination of window (30) i.e., the destination operation for each window may be made which in turn, aides in the decision as to where to place window (30).

In regards to claim **22**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***wherein determining a destination location for said graphical component comprises weighting a plurality of possible locations based on the characteristics of said plurality of locations and selecting said destination location based on said weighting.***

As shown in the flowchart of Fig. 9 of Butler, MoveCursor( ) determines which monitor is closest in Euclidean distance to each of the monitors (904) (*said weighting*) [column 10, line 6]. Once determined, Movecursor( ) picks the monitor having the shortest distance to the clipped point and moves the cursor to a location on the edge (or just inside) of that monitor space (906) [column 10, lines 66 – 67]. The same reasons for combining as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claims **23/9** and **23/22**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***a computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions for performing the method of the claimed invention***.

In regards to claims 23/9 and 23/22, claims 23/9 and 23/22 recites similar limitations as claims 9 and 22 respectively, and thus, is rejected with the same basis and rationale as claims 9 and 22. Furthermore, Horvitz teaches a computer program is used to implement the various steps of Horvitz and is located in the memory unit (20) of Fig. 2, and the processes of Horvitz are carried out through the use of a CPU (22) [Horvitz: col. 7, lines 5-9]. The same reasons for combing as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claims **24/9** and **24/22**, Horvitz in view of Butler teaches ***a computer system having a processor and a memory storing computer-executable instructions operative to perform the method of the claimed invention.***

In regards to claims 24/9 and 24/22, claims 24/9 and 24/22 recites similar limitations as claims 9 and 22 and thus, is rejected with the same basis and rationale as claims 9 and 22. Furthermore, Horvitz teaches a computer program is used to implement the various steps of Horvitz and is located in the memory unit (20) of Fig. 2, and the processes of Horvitz are carried out through the use of a CPU (22) [col. 7, lines 5-9]. The same reasons for combing as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

In regards to claim **28**, claim 28 recites similar limitations as claims 22 and 25 and thus, is rejected with the same basis and rationale as claims 22 and 25. Furthermore, the same reasons for combining as applied to claim 9 is incorporated herein.

3. Claim **29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz et al. (5,880,733) in view of Ellison-Taylor (5,796,402).

Horvitz teaches the limitations of claim 29 with the exception of disclosing the expansion of the window to fill the optimal open destination. However, Ellison-Taylor teaches a computer system that automatically positions and aligns windows on a computer screen without creating overlaps.

In regards to claim **29**, Horvitz in view of Ellison-Taylor teaches ***wherein said window expands to fill the area of said optimal open destination.***

Ellison-Taylor discloses a method and system for automatically positioning windows based on the current position and size of the windows. The tiling program aligns the windows based on the relative position and size of the windows by calculating new coordinates of the windows and providing the new coordinates to the operating system [col. 3, lines 32-37]. The tiling program aligns the windows so that their sides touch and so that they fill a bounding window (e.g., the entire computer screen) within which they are currently displayed. The tiling program aligns the windows so as to approximate the relative position and size of the currently displayed windows [col. 3, lines 42-47]. As shown in Figs. 5A-F, the

invention of Ellison-Taylor aligns and resizes the windows to fill the entire bounding window. Furthermore, the tiling program removes overlaps by adjusting the sides of the overlapping windows, as shown for windows B and D in Fig. 5B [col. 4, lines 20-22]. After the tiling program has aligned the windows, the tiling program fills the bounding window with the aligned windows, as shown in Fig. 5E.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system of Horvitz with the tiling program of Elliot-Taylor so that when the active window is moved to an open location, the active window adjusts to the size of the destination location so that overlap with other graphical objects does not occur to ensure that all content of each window can be seen and used by the user.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle K. Lay whose telephone number is (571) 272-7661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee M. Tung, can be reached at (571) 272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michelle K. Lay
Patent Examiner
Division 2628
06.26.2006 mkl

PATENT EXAMINER

Kee M. Tung
Primary Examiner